UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/634,535	08/05/2003	Henry Frank Gasbarro	NG(MS)-6619	6064

26294 7590 12/24/2009
TAROLLI, SUNDHEIM, COVELL & TUMMINO L.L.P.
1300 EAST NINTH STREET, SUITE 1700
CLEVEVLAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
BROADHEAD, BRIAN J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3664	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/634,535	GASBARRO, HENRY FRANK	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	BRIAN J. BROADHEAD	3664	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *31 August 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,8-14,16-18 and 25-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *8-14 and 16-18* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6 and 25-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-6, and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the handheld computing device" in 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification does not disclose the handheld device being destroyed by a command from the user. The specification does disclose the memory being wiped.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich et al., 6148261, in view of Dudas et al., 6104620.

3. As per claims 1, 25, 29, 30, Obradovich et al. disclose a GPS module that produces locations information associates with the position of the module and handheld computing device in line 12, col.2; an L-band transceiver that broadcasts the location information to a satellite relay and receives location information from the at least one portable communications device via the satellite relay on line 16, on col. 7, and on lines 48, on col. 11 through line 14, on col. 12, the disclosure of satellite communications would include L-band frequencies; a processing unit that provides messages to the L-band transceiver and updates a display associated with the tablet computer assembly according to the received location information and the location information produced at the GPS module in figure 4, on lines 13-23, on col. 7and item 21, and an internal power supply is inherent. Obradovich et el. do not disclose an electrically conductive enclosure around the L-band transceiver (Faraday cage) to reduce EM interference and the Faraday cage being configured as a heat sink to draw away heat away and the module is easy to remove from the handheld computing device and that the communications module can be connected to the handheld device and removed from the device without substantial invasion of the device. Dudas et al. teach Faraday cage around electronics to reduce EM interference and the Faraday cage being configured as a heat sink to draw away heat away in the figures and on columns 3-5; and that the

communications module can be connected to the handheld device and removed from the device without substantial invasion of the device and the conductive backplate is configured so that at least a portion of the handheld computing device can be mechanically mounted on the back plate (the card and device fit together); and a port for exchange of data and power in column 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the shielding of Dudas et al. in the invention of Obradovich et al. because such modification would prevent the electromagnetic interference that can occur with a large number of electronic circuits are placed in close proximity to each other. Shielding and heat issues are well known to anyone of ordinary skill in the art and the configuration claimed in the current invention is safely within the ordinary creativity of one of ordinary skill in the art.

4. As per claims 26, official notice is given that self destruct commands or memory erase commands were well known in the art at the time the invention was made. This limitations could be viewed as a simple "format" command issued by a user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have a self destruct command because it would allow for protection of privacy and control of data on the device.

5. As per claim 27, official notice is given that it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to use encryption/decryption in communications. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to sue decryption of the messages in the invention of Obradovich et al. and Dudas et al. because it would ensure privacy.

6. As per claim 28, official notice is given that it was well known in the art at the time the invention was made to have power regulation of PDAs or portable computers and their peripherals. Windows laptops have had utilities for this many years prior. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to control power use because it would prevent battery drain.

7. As per claim 31, Obradovich et al. and Dudas et al. do not disclose the conductive back plate being configured to replace a back plate of the handheld computing device, and a remainder of the electrically conductive enclosure being separable from the back plate as to allow connection and disconnection of the L-band transceiver and global positioning system from the handheld computing device. Obradovich et al. and Dudas et al. do suggest the benefit of modularity. Deciding how that modularity takes shape requires only routine skill in the art when there are no unpredictable results. It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the conductive back plate configured to replace a back plate of the handheld computing device, and have the remainder of the electrically conductive enclosure being separable from the back plate as to allow connection and disconnection of the L-band transceiver and global positioning system from the handheld computing device because it would only involve routine skill in the art and not yield unpredictable results.

8. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich et al., 6148261, in view of Dudas et al., 6104620as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Gilbert et al., US2003/0032426.

9. Obradovich et al. and Dudas et al., disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose a single antenna to facilitate the transmission and reception of the messages by the L-band transmitter and the GPS module. Gilbert et al. teaches using one antenna for both the GPS and L-band transceiver in paragraph 53. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use one antenna instead of two because is would reduce costs. The trade off would just be that data transmissions would be restricted some.

10. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich et al., 6148261, in view of Dudas et al., 6104620, and further in view of Gilbert et al., US2003/0032426 as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Saunders et al., US2005/0162334.

11. Obradovich et al., Dudas et al., and Gilbert disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose using a quadrifilar helix antenna (QHA). Saunders et al. teach using a QHA in paragraph 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a QHA because they can be small and compact, and are relatively insensitive to the effects of handling as disclosed in paragraph 2 of Saunders.

12. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich et al., 6148261, in view of Dudas et al., as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bielby, "Xilinx".

13. Obradovich et al. and Dudas et al. disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose an I/O board that translates communication between the L-band

transceiver and the handheld computing device and the internal power supply (which is inherent in Obradovich) being connected to the communications module. Bielby teaches the I/O board used is the ISA or PCI bus of the computer. An ISA and PCI bus include power. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the ISA or PCI bus along with their associated control boards because such modification would be cheaper and eliminate the need to an case and external power supply as discloses by Bielby on page 5.

14. Claims 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich et al., 6148261, in view of Dudas et al., 5160807, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lada et al., 2005/0114553.

15. Obradovich et al. and Dudas et al. disclose the limitations as set forth above. They do not disclose a battery that is attachable to the internal power source or battery of the handheld computing device. Lada et al. teaches a battery that is attachable to the internal power source or battery of the handheld in paragraphs 40-41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the battery of Lada et al. in the invention of Obradovich et al. and Dudas et al. because such modification would extend the life of the first battery as stated in Lada et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 through 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Khoi Tran can be reached on 571-272-6919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/B. J. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 3664

/KHOI TRAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3664